

Applicant: Antti Poikolainen et al.
Application No.: 10/525,595
Response to Office action mailed May 14, 2007
Response filed August 8, 2007

Remarks

Claims 12–16 and 18–22 remain pending in the application. In the Office action dated May 14, 2007, claims 11, 16–18, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lee (US 3,150,037), and claims 11, 12, 16, 17, 19, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Heikkila et al. (WO 01/31120). Claims 13–15 and 20–21 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In accordance with examiner's suggestion, claims 13, 14, 20, and 21 have been rewritten in independent form including the base claim from which they depended. Claim 15 has been left as depending from allowable claim 14.

Claim 18 has also been rewritten in independent form. Claim 18 was only rejected as anticipated by Lee and not as anticipated by Heikkila et al. Claim 18 further comprises the step of regulating a dewatering ratio between the suction roll and the suction box to control the two-sidedness of the paper web. Although applying suction to both sides of a web is known, Lee does not suggest control of the two-sidedness of the paper web with a suction roll and a curved suction box.

Claims 12, 16, 19, 22 have been amended to depend from allowable claims adding further limitation to the independent claim from which they depend.

The specification at ¶ [0018] explains, by regulating the dewatering ratio between the curved surface suction boxes and the suction roll it is possible to regulate dewatering in both directions so that the web is not formed in an asymmetric manner. Lee, on the other hand, discloses that Lee “provides for the application of a pressure differential from one side of the web to the other in such a manner as to cooperate with the action of the other liquid extracting forces to thereby provide still further increasing liquid removal” (column 8, lines 69–73). The other liquid extraction forces (column 3, lines 14–20) are caused by centrifugal action as a result of changing the direction of travel of the web, and are “enhanced by establishing a positive flow of gas through the web” (column 3, lines 35–40). Thus in FIG. 1 of Lee the

Applicant: Antti Poikolainen et al.
Application No.: 10/525,595
Response to Office action mailed May 14, 2007
Response filed August 8, 2007

dewatering taking place at rolls 35 and 39 is, in both cases, away from the surface of the rolls, whereas claim 18 requires water removal in two directions, at the same location, i.e., "the suction box positioned with the curved surface in opposed relationship with the suction roll" claim 18, lines 14-15.

Heikkila et al. (WO 01/31120), which was not applied by the examiner to claim 18, does not suggest the step of "regulating a dewatering ratio between the suction roll and the suction box to control the two-sidedness of the paper web" as claimed.

Applicant believes that no new matter has been added by this amendment.

Applicant submits that the claims, as amended, are in condition for allowance.
Favorable action thereon is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Patrick J. G. Stiennon, Reg. No. 34934
Attorney for Applicant
Stiennon & Stiennon
P.O. Box 1667
Madison, Wisconsin 53701-1667
(608) 250-4870
Amdt2.res

August 8, 2007 (5:42pm)